© 2016 S. Salehi & P. Seraji

arXiv:1612.02549v1 [math.LO] 8 Dec 2016

SUBMITTED MANUSCRIPT

Constructibility and Rosserizability of the Proofs of BOOLOS *and* CHAITIN *for* GÖDEL*'s Incompleteness Theorem*

SAEED SALEHI and PAYAM SERAJI

Abstract The proofs of Chaitin and Boolos for Gödel's Incompleteness Theorem are studied from the perspectives of constructibility and Rosserizability. By Rosserization of a proof we mean that the independence of the true but unprovable sentence can be shown by assuming only the (simple) consistency of the theory. It is known that Gödel's own proof for his incompleteness theorem is not Rosserizable, and we show that neither are Kleene's or Boolos' proofs. However, we prove a Rosserized version of Chaitin's (incompleteness) theorem. The proofs of Gödel, Rosser and Kleene are constructive in the sense that they explicitly construct, by algorithmic ways, the independent sentence(s) from the theory. We show that the proofs of Chaitin and Boolos are not constructive, and they prove only the mere existence of the independent sentences.

1 Introduction

A constructive proof provides an algorithm for constructing the claimed object; a non-constructive proof does not show the existence of that object algorithmically, while sometimes an effective procedure might be hidden inside the details. A proof then *is proved to be (essentially) non-constructive* when one can show that there is no algorithm (computable function) which, given the assumptions (coded as input), produces the claimed object whose existence is demonstrated in the proof. Below, we will see one example of a (seemingly) non-constructive proof (namely, the proof of Kleene [10] for Gödel's first incompleteness theorem) which can be constructive (effectivized) by unpacking some details; we will also see a couple of proofs (namely, the proofs of Boolos [2] and Chaitin [3] for Gödel's first incompleteness theorem) that are shown to be non-constructive, by proving the non-existence of any algorithm for computing the claimed object (namely, the true but unprovable sentence).

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: Primary 03F40, 03F30; Secondary 03D32
Keywords: Constructive Proof, Incompleteness, Gödel's Proof, Rosser's Proof, Kleene's Proof, Chaitin's Proof, Boolos' Proof.

Gödel's original proof [5] for his incompleteness theorem is constructive, i.e., given a (finite) description of a consistent RE theory (e.g. an input-free program which outputs the set of all the axioms of the theory) the proof exhibits, in an algorithmic way, a sentence which is true (in the standard model of natural numbers $\mathbb{N}$) but unprovable in the theory. For the independence of this sentence from the theory (i.e., the unprovability of its negation in the theory) Gödel also assumes the theory to be ω-consistent; so if the theory is ω-consistent, then that (true) sentence is independent from the theory (see e.g. [19, 18]). It turned out later that the simple consistency of the theory does not suffice for the independence of the Gödel sentence (from the theory) and the optimal condition (which is much weaker than ω-consistency) is *the consistency of the theory with its own consistency statement* ([6, Theorems 35,36]). Rosser's proof [14] for Gödel's first incompleteness theorem assumes only the simple consistency of the (RE) theory and constructs (algorithmically) an independent (and true) sentence. So, one can say that Gödel's proof is not Rosserizable. Here, we will see that while the proof of Chaitin is Rosserizable (i.e., the independence of Chaitin's sentence from the theory can be proved by assuming only the simple consistency of the theory), the proof of Boolos is not (and the optimal condition for the independence of Boolos' sentence is the consistency of the theory with its own consistency statement).

2 The Proof of Kleene for Gödel's Incompleteness Theorem

A very cute proof for Gödel's incompleteness theorem is that of Kleene (see e.g. [10, 18]) which deserves more recognition.

Notation 2.1 (Computability) Let $\varphi_0, \varphi_1, \varphi_2, \cdots$ be a list of all unary computable (partial recursive) functions. A recursively enumerable set (RE for short) is the domain of φ_i, for some $i \in \mathbb{N}$, which is denoted by $\mathscr{W}_i$. The notation $\varphi_i(j)\uparrow$ symbolizes the fact that the function φ_i is not defined at j, or $j \notin \mathscr{W}_i$; thus $\varphi_i(j)\downarrow$ means that φ_i is defined at j or $j \in \mathscr{W}_i$, and $\varphi_i(j)\downarrow = k$ means that φ_i is defined at j and equals to k, i.e., $\varphi_i(j) = k$. ⊛

Robinson's Arithmetic is denoted by Q (see e.g. [18]).

Theorem 2.2 (Kleene's Theorem) *For a given consistent and* RE *theory T that contains Q there exists some $t \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\varphi_t(t)\uparrow$ but $T \nvdash$ "$\varphi_t(t)\uparrow$".*

Non-Constructive Proof Let $K_T = \{n \in \mathbb{N} \mid T \vdash \text{"}\varphi_n(n)\uparrow\text{"}\}$; then we have $K_T \subseteq K = \{n \in \mathbb{N} \mid \varphi_n(n)\uparrow\}$ since if $T \vdash$ "$\varphi_n(n)\uparrow$" but $\varphi_n(n)\downarrow$ then the true Σ_1-sentence "$\varphi_n(n)\downarrow$" is provable in (the Σ_1-complete theory) Q ($\supseteq T$) contradicting the consistency of T. Now, since T is RE then so is K_T, while K is not an RE set because for any n we have $n \in K \iff n \notin \mathscr{W}_n$ and so $n \in (K - \mathscr{W}_n) \cup (\mathscr{W}_n - K)$, thus $K \neq \mathscr{W}_n$ for all n. So, $K_T \subsetneq K$; therefore, there must exist some $t \in K - K_T$. For this t we have $\varphi_t(t)\uparrow$ but $T \nvdash$ "$\varphi_t(t)\uparrow$". ⊠

Of course if T is sound (i.e., $\mathbb{N} \models T$) or even Σ_1-sound (i.e., $T \vdash \sigma \in \Sigma_1 \Longrightarrow \mathbb{N} \models \sigma$, cf. [6]) then also $T \nvdash$ "$\varphi_t(t)\downarrow$", i.e., the sentence "$\varphi_t(t)\uparrow$" is (true and) independent from T. Let us note that the above proof did not explicitly specify $t \in \mathbb{N}$.

Constructive Proof Since $K_T = \{n \in \mathbb{N} \mid T \vdash \text{"}\varphi_n(n)\uparrow\text{"}\}$ is RE then $K_T = \mathscr{W}_{\mathtt{t}}$ for some $\mathtt{t} \in \mathbb{N}$ which can be algorithmically computed from a description of the RE theory T. Now we show the truth of "$\varphi_{\mathtt{t}}(\mathtt{t})\uparrow$" as follows:

SUBMITTED MANUSCRIPT

$$\begin{array}{lll}
\varphi_{\mathtt{t}}(\mathtt{t})\downarrow & \Longrightarrow & T \vdash \text{“}\varphi_{\mathtt{t}}(\mathtt{t})\downarrow\text{”} \quad \text{(by the } \Sigma_1\text{-completeness of } Q \supseteq T\text{)} \\
& \Longrightarrow & T \nvdash \text{“}\varphi_{\mathtt{t}}(\mathtt{t})\uparrow\text{”} \quad \text{(by the consistency of } T\text{)} \\
& \Longrightarrow & \mathtt{t} \notin K_T \quad \text{(by the definition of } K_T\text{)} \\
& \Longrightarrow & \mathtt{t} \notin \mathscr{W}_{\mathtt{t}} \quad \text{(by } K_T = \mathscr{W}_{\mathtt{t}}\text{)} \\
& \Longrightarrow & \varphi_{\mathtt{t}}(\mathtt{t})\uparrow \quad \text{(by the definition of } \mathscr{W}_{\mathtt{t}}\text{)}
\end{array}$$

Thus, $\mathtt{t} \notin \mathscr{W}_{\mathtt{t}}$ and so $\mathtt{t} \notin K_T$ whence $T \nvdash \text{“}\varphi_{\mathtt{t}}(\mathtt{t})\uparrow\text{”}$. ⊠

For Rosserizing this beautiful theorem of Kleene some more tools and techniques are needed; see [11] where Kleene calls it the "symmetric form" of Gödel's (incompleteness) theorem (see also [16] for a modern treatment). Below we show that Kleene's (constructive) proof cannot be Rosserized per se and those new tools and techniques are really needed.

Theorem 2.3 (Non-Rosserizability of Kleene's Proof) *There exists an* RE *and consistent theory U such that $U \vdash \text{“}\varphi_u(u)\downarrow\text{”}$ for some $u \in \mathbb{N}$ which satisfies ($\varphi_u(u)\uparrow$ and) $\mathscr{W}_u = \{n \in \mathbb{N} \mid U \vdash \text{“}\varphi_n(n)\uparrow\text{”}\}$.*

Proof There exists a computable (and total) function $\overline{h}$ such that for any sentence ψ we have $\mathscr{W}_{\overline{h}(\psi)} = \{n \in \mathbb{N} \mid Q + \psi \vdash \text{“}\varphi_n(n)\uparrow\text{”}\}$. By the Diagonal Lemma there exists a sentence λ such that $Q \vdash \lambda \leftrightarrow \text{“}\varphi_{\overline{h}(\lambda)}\big(\overline{h}(\lambda)\big)\downarrow\text{”}$. Clearly, for $U = Q + \lambda$ and $u = \overline{h}(\lambda)$ we have $U \vdash \text{“}\varphi_u(u)\downarrow\text{”}$ and $\mathscr{W}_u = \{n \in \mathbb{N} \mid U \vdash \text{“}\varphi_n(n)\uparrow\text{”}\}$. It remains to show that U is consistent: Otherwise, $Q \vdash \neg\lambda$ and so $Q \vdash \text{“}\varphi_u(u)\uparrow\text{”}$ which implies that $Q + \lambda \vdash \text{“}\varphi_u(u)\uparrow\text{”}$ whence $u \in \mathscr{W}_{\overline{h}(\lambda)} = \mathscr{W}_u$. On the other hand $Q \vdash \text{“}\varphi_u(u)\uparrow\text{”}$ also implies that $\varphi_u(u)\uparrow$ and so $u \notin \mathscr{W}_u$; a contradiction. ⊠

Summing up, for any consistent and RE extension T of Q we have $\varphi_{\mathtt{t}}(\mathtt{t})\uparrow$ and $T \nvdash \text{“}\varphi_{\mathtt{t}}(\mathtt{t})\uparrow\text{”}$ for any $\mathtt{t}$ which satisfies $\mathscr{W}_{\mathtt{t}} = \{n \in \mathbb{N} \mid T \vdash \text{“}\varphi_n(n)\uparrow\text{”}\}$. Moreover, if T is Σ_1-sound then $\varphi_{\mathtt{t}}(\mathtt{t})\uparrow$ is independent from T (i.e., also $T \nvdash \text{“}\varphi_{\mathtt{t}}(\mathtt{t})\downarrow\text{”}$). However, if the theory T is not Σ_1-sound then $\varphi_{\mathtt{t}}(\mathtt{t})\uparrow$ might not be independent from T (and its negation could be provable in T) for some $\mathtt{t}$ with $\mathscr{W}_{\mathtt{t}} = \{n \in \mathbb{N} \mid T \vdash \text{“}\varphi_n(n)\uparrow\text{”}\}$.

3 The Proof of Chaitin for Gödel's Incompleteness Theorem

There are various versions of Chaitin's proof for the incompleteness theorem [3], which is sometimes called "Chaitin's incompleteness theorem"; this proof appears in e.g. [4, 13, 1, 20]. We consider the version presented in [1].

Definition 3.1 (Kolmogorov-Chaitin Complexity) For any natural number m let $\mathscr{K}(m) = \min\{i \in \mathbb{N} \mid \varphi_i(0)\downarrow = m\}$. ⊛

The function $\mathscr{K}$ is total and for any $e \in \mathbb{N}$ there are finitely many m's which satisfy $\mathscr{K}(m) \leqslant e$. The following is Lemma 7 of [1].

Lemma 3.2 (Uncomputability of Complexity) *There is no computable function f which satisfies $\mathscr{K}\big(f(m)\big) > m$ for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$.*

Proof If there were such a computable function f, then by Kleene's second recursion theorem there would exist some e such that $\varphi_e(x) = f(e)$ and so, in particular, $\varphi_e(0) = f(e)$ which implies $\mathscr{K}\big(f(e)\big) \leqslant e$; a contradiction. ⊠

So, the function $\mathscr{K}$ is not computable, since otherwise $f(x) = \min\{y \mid \mathscr{K}(y) > x\}$, which satisfies $\forall x : \mathscr{K}\big(f(x)\big) > x$, would be computable.

SUBMITTED MANUSCRIPT

Theorem 3.3 (Chaitin's Theorem) *For any consistent and* RE *theory T which contains Q there exists a constant $c_T \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for any $e \geqslant c_T$ and any $w \in \mathbb{N}$ we have $T \nvdash$ "$\mathscr{K}(w) > e$".*

Proof If not, then for any given $m \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists some $e \geqslant m$ and some w such that $T \vdash$ "$\mathscr{K}(w) > e$". Let us note that if $T \vdash$ "$\mathscr{K}(w) > e$" for a consistent $T \supseteq Q$ then $\mathscr{K}(w) > e$, since otherwise, if $\mathscr{K}(w) \leqslant e$, the true Σ_1-sentence "$\mathscr{K}(w) \leqslant e$" would be provable in Q (and so in T) which contradicts the consistency of T. Now, for a given m we can, by an algorithmic proof search in T, find some $e \geqslant m$ and w such that $T \vdash$ "$\mathscr{K}(w) > e$" (and so $\mathscr{K}(w) > e$); our assumption guarantees the termination of this algorithm for any input m. Let $f(m)$ be one of those w's; then $\mathscr{K}\big(f(m)\big) > e \geqslant m$ contradicting Lemma 3.2. ⊠

This is an incompleteness theorem since for any c there are cofinitely many w's with $\mathscr{K}(w) > c$. So, for a given T which is consistent and RE and contains Q there are cofinitely many w's such that the true sentences "$\mathscr{K}(w) > c_T$" are unprovable in T. As for the constructivity of this proof, the good news is that a constant c_T which satisfies Chaitin's Theorem (3.3) can be algorithmically constructed from T.

Theorem 3.4 (Computing a Chaitin Constant) *For a given consistent and* RE *extension T of Q one can algorithmically construct a constant c_T such that for all $e \geqslant c_T$ and all w, we have $T \nvdash$ "$\mathscr{K}(w) > e$".*

Proof Given a description of a consistent, Σ_1-complete and RE theory T the following can be done algorithmically. Define $\overline{h}(x,y)$ to be the minimum of the ordered pairs (in a total and computable sorting of all ordered pairs) $\langle a,b\rangle$ such that $b \geqslant x$ and $T \vdash$ "$\mathscr{K}(a) > b$" (if any). This is (a partially) computable (function) and an index of it can be calculated from (a description of) T. By Kleene's second recursion theorem there exists a constant c such that $\varphi_c(y) = \overline{h}_1(c,y)$, where $\overline{h}_1(x,y)$ is the first component of the ordered pair $\overline{h}(x,y)$. The constant c can be computed from T; let us denote it by c_T. Now, we show that for no $b \geqslant c_T$ and no a can $T \vdash$ "$\mathscr{K}(a) > b$" hold. If $\langle a,b\rangle$ is the minimum of all ordered pairs with $b \geqslant c_T$ and $T \vdash$ "$\mathscr{K}(a) > b$", then $\overline{h}(c_T,0) = \langle a,b\rangle$ and so $\varphi_{c_T}(0) = \overline{h}_1(c_T,0) = a$. Thus, $\mathscr{K}(a) \leqslant c_T$, and by the Σ_1-completeness of T we have $T \vdash$ "$\mathscr{K}(a) \leqslant c_T$". But from $T \vdash$ "$\mathscr{K}(a) > b$" and $b \geqslant c_T$ we have $T \vdash$ "$\mathscr{K}(a) > c_T$", contradicting the consistency of T. ⊠

Unfortunately, by Lemma 3.2 one cannot calculate a w with $\mathscr{K}(w) > c_T$ given c_T for a theory T. Otherwise one could get a constructive version of Chaitin's proof: Given a consistent and RE theory $T \supseteq Q$ one calculates c_T and finds some w with $\mathscr{K}(w) > c_T$; then "$\mathscr{K}(w) > c_T$" is a true sentence which is not provable in T. It is actually known that Chaitin's proof is not constructive; see e.g. [13, page 1394] or [20, page 95].

Theorem 3.5 (Non-Constructivity of Chaitin's Proof) *There is no algorithm such that for a given consistent and* RE *extension T of Q can compute some w_T such that both $T \nvdash$ "$\mathscr{K}(w_T) > c_T$" and $\mathscr{K}(w_T) > c_T$ hold together, where c_T is a Chaitin constant as in Theorem 3.4.*

Proof If such a w_T were computable from T, then the theory $T_\infty = \bigcup_{i\in\mathbb{N}} T_i$ would be RE where $T_0 = Q$ and inductively $T_{i+1} = T_i +$ "$\mathscr{K}(w_{T_i}) > c_{T_i}$" are defined by iterating the computation procedure. The theory T_∞ is also consistent (indeed, sound) and contains Q, so by Chaitin's Theorem (3.3) there should exist some constant c_{T_∞}

SUBMITTED MANUSCRIPT

such that for no w can we have $T_\infty \vdash$ "$\mathscr{K}(w) > c_{T_\infty}$". But this is a contradiction because we have $c_{T_i} < c_{T_{i+1}}$ and also $c_{T_i} < c_{T_\infty}$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$. ⊠

The true unprovable sentences "$\mathscr{K}(w) > e$" (for $e \geqslant c_T$) are also independent when T is a (Σ_1-)sound theory: If $T \vdash$ "$\mathscr{K}(w) \leqslant e$" then the Σ_1-sentence $\mathscr{K}(w) \leqslant e$ has to be true, a contradiction. So, we restate Chaitin's Theorem as follows.

Corollary 3.6 (Chaitin's Theorem, restated) *For any Σ_1-sound and* RE *theory T with $T \supseteq Q$ there is some c_T (which is computable from T) such that for any $e \geqslant c_T$ there are cofinitely many w's such that "$\mathscr{K}(w) > e$" is independent from T.* ⊠

By Rosserizing Chaitin's Theorem we mean replacing the assumption of the "Σ_1-soundness" (of T) in Corollary 3.6 with (its simple) "consistency". For doing that we need the following version of the Pigeonhole Principle in Q.

Lemma 3.7 (A Pigeonhole Principle) *For any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ we have*

$$Q \vdash \forall z_0, \cdots, z_k \Big(\bigwedge_{0 \leqslant i \leqslant k} z_i < \overline{k} \longrightarrow \bigvee_{0 \leqslant i,j \leqslant k}^{i \neq j} z_i = z_j \Big).$$

Proof This can be proved by induction (in the metalanguage) on k: for $k = 0$ it suffices to note that $Q \vdash \forall z \neg(z < 0)$ and for the induction step it suffices to use the derivation $Q \vdash \forall z(z < \overline{k+1} \to z < \overline{k} \vee z = \overline{k})$; cf. [18, page 73]. ⊠

Theorem 3.8 (Rosserization of Chaitin's Theorem) *For any consistent and* RE *extension T of Q there is a constant c_T (which is computable from T) such that for any $e \geqslant c_T$ there are cofinitely many w's such that "$\mathscr{K}(w) > e$" is independent from T.*

Proof By Chaitin's Theorem (3.3) there exists a constant c_T (which is computable from T) such that for any $e \geqslant c_T$ there are cofinitely many w's such that "$\mathscr{K}(w) > e$" is true but unprovable in T. Fix an $\mathsf{e} \geqslant c_T$. For no w can $T \vdash$ "$\mathscr{K}(w) > \mathsf{e}$" hold, and $T \vdash$ "$\mathscr{K}(w) \leqslant \mathsf{e}$" can hold for at most $(\mathsf{e}+1)$-many w's: if for some distinct $\mathsf{w}_0, \mathsf{w}_1, \ldots, \mathsf{w}_{\mathsf{e}+1}$, the derivations $T \vdash$ "$\mathscr{K}(\mathsf{w}_i) \leqslant \mathsf{e}$" hold ($i = 0, 1, \ldots, \mathsf{e}{+}1$) then $T \vdash \exists z_0, z_1, \ldots, z_{\mathsf{e}+1} \big(\bigwedge_{i=0}^{\mathsf{e}+1} [z_i \leqslant \overline{\mathsf{e}} \wedge \varphi_{z_i}(0)\!\downarrow = \mathsf{w}_i] \big)$ and so $T \vdash \exists z_0, z_1, \ldots, z_{\mathsf{e}+1} \big(\bigwedge_{0 \leqslant i \leqslant \mathsf{e}+1} [z_i < \overline{\mathsf{e}} + 1] \wedge \bigwedge_{0 \leqslant i,j \leqslant \mathsf{e}+1}^{i \neq j} [z_i \neq z_j] \big)$ which contradicts Lemma 3.7 (for $k = \mathsf{e}+1$). Thus, for cofinitely many w's we should have both $T \nvdash$ "$\mathscr{K}(w) > \mathsf{e}$" and $T \nvdash$ "$\mathscr{K}(w) \leqslant \mathsf{e}$". ⊠

Martin Davis [4] calls Chaitin's Theorem "a dramatic extension of Gödel's incompleteness theorem". We saw that this theorem as presented in Corollary 3.6 can be hardly considered an extension of Gödel's incompleteness theorem, as Gödel's proof is constructive while Chaitin's is not (Theorem 3.5). The Rosserized form of Chaitin's Theorem as presented in Theorem 3.8 could be considered as an extension of Gödel's and Chaitin's theorems in a sense (from the Rosserization viewpoint), even though, it is not any more extension than Rosser's own [14]; let us also note that Rosser's proof is constructive (while the proof of Theorem 3.8 is not).

4 The Proof of Boolos for Gödel's Incompleteness Theorem

Jon Barwise calls it "a very lovely proof of Gödel's Incompleteness Theorem, probably the deepest single result about the relationship between computers and mathematics", and mentions that it is "the most straightforward proof of this result that I

SUBMITTED MANUSCRIPT

have ever seen"[1]. After its first appearance in [2] this proof was discussed, extended and studied in e.g. [7, 8, 15, 12, 17, 9].

Notation 4.1 (Arithmetization) For an RE theory T denote the provability predicate of T by $Pr_T(x)$; so the consistency statement of T is $Con(T) = \neg Pr_T(\bot)$. Suppose that the variables are $x, x', x'', x''', \cdots$ whose lengths are $1, 2, 3, 4, \cdots$, respectively. ⊛

So, for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ there are at most finitely many formulas with length k.

Definition 4.2 (Formalization of Berry's Paradox) For a formula $\psi(x_1, \cdots, x_m)$ with the shown (possibly empty) set of free variables ($m \geqslant 0$) and number n, let $D(\psi, n)$ be the (Gödel code of the) formula $\forall x[\psi(x, \cdots, x) \leftrightarrow x = \overline{n}]$. The number n is definable in T by the formula ψ when $Pr_T\big(D(\psi, n)\big)$ holds.
Let $Def_T(y,z) = \exists x\big[len(x) < z \wedge Pr_T\big(D(x,y)\big)\big]$, where $len(x)$ denotes the length of (the formula with Gödel code) x. The formula $Def_T(y,z)$ states that "there is a formula $\psi(x_1, \cdots, x_m)$ with length smaller than z such that $T \vdash \forall x[\psi(x, \cdots, x) \leftrightarrow x = \overline{y}]$", or informally "the number y is definable in T by a formula with length less than z".
Let $Berry_T(u,v) = \neg Def_T(u,v) \wedge \forall y < u\, Def_T(y,v)$, meaning that "$u$ is the least number not definable by a formula with length less than v".
Let ℓ_T be the length of $Berry_T(x,x')$ and $Boolos_T(x) = \exists x'\big[x' = \overline{5}\cdot\overline{\ell_T} \wedge Berry_T(x,x')\big]$.
Let b_T be the least number not definable by a formula with length less than $5\ell_T$. ⊛

Peano's Arithmetic is denoted by PA (see e.g. [18]).

Theorem 4.3 (Boolos' Theorem) *For any consistent and* RE *extension T of PA, the sentence $Boolos_T(\overline{b_T})$ is (true but) unprovable in T.*

Proof Assume (for the sake of contradiction) that $T \vdash Boolos_T(\overline{b_T})$. Then since $PA \vdash [Berry_T(u,v) \wedge Berry_T(u',v) \rightarrow u = u']$ holds, $T \vdash \forall x[Boolos_T(x) \leftrightarrow x = \overline{b_T}]$. Thus, b_T is definable in T by the formula $Boolos_T(x)$ whose length is less than $\ell_T + len(\overline{5}\cdot\overline{\ell_T}) + 9 = 4\ell_T + 26 < 5\ell_T$ (since, for any m, the term $\overline{m} = s(\cdots(s(0))\ldots)$ [m-times s] has length $3m+1$). So, the Σ_1-sentence $Def_T(\overline{b_T}, \overline{5}\cdot\overline{\ell_T})$ is true, thus provable in PA; whence $T \vdash Def_T(\overline{b_T}, \overline{5}\cdot\overline{\ell_T})$. On the other hand $T \vdash Boolos_T(\overline{b_T})$ implies that $T \vdash \neg Def_T(\overline{b_T}, \overline{5}\cdot\overline{\ell_T})$, contradicting the consistency of T. ⊠

The formula $Boolos_T(\overline{b_T})$ is not Π_1; however, the following modification from [7] proves a Π_1-incompleteness.

Theorem 4.4 (Boolos' Theorem, modified) *For any consistent and* RE *extension T of PA, the true Π_1-sentence $\neg Def_T(\overline{b_T}, \overline{5}\cdot\overline{\ell_T})$ is unprovable in T.*

Proof Assume $T \vdash \neg Def_T(\overline{b_T}, \overline{5}\cdot\overline{\ell_T})$. Since any number y less than b_T is definable by a formula with length less than $5\ell_T$ then the Σ_1-formula $\forall y < b_T\ Def_T(\overline{b_T}, \overline{5}\cdot\overline{\ell_T})$ is true and thus provable in T. Therefore, $\neg Def_T(\overline{b_T}, \overline{5}\cdot\overline{\ell_T}) \wedge \forall y < b_T\ Def_T(\overline{b_T}, \overline{5}\cdot\overline{\ell_T})$ is provable in T and so $T \vdash Boolos_T(\overline{b_T})$, contradicting Theorem 4.3. ⊠

Even though ℓ_T is computable from T, below we show that one cannot calculate b_T.

Theorem 4.5 (Non-Constructivity of Boolos' Proof) *There is no algorithm such that for a given consistent and* RE *extension T of PA can compute b_T.*

Proof Assume that b_T is computable from T, and let $T_0 = PA$ and inductively $T_{j+1} = T_j + \neg \mathsf{Def}_{T_j}(\overline{b_{T_j}}, \overline{5}\cdot\overline{\ell_{T_j}})$. Define the function $\bar{h}(n)$, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, to be the maximum of m's such that $\forall j < m : len(\text{“}\varphi_j(0)\!\downarrow = x\text{”}) < n$. This is a computable

SUBMITTED MANUSCRIPT

and non-decreasing function; also $\lim_n \overline{h}(n) = \infty$. So, from $\lim_j \ell_{T_j} = \infty$ we have $\lim_j \overline{h}(5\ell_{T_j}) = \infty$. Therefore, for any (given) x one can compute some $\iota(x)$ such that $\overline{h}(5\ell_{T_{\iota(x)}}) > x$. The proof will be complete when show that $\mathscr{K}(b_{T_j}) \geqslant \overline{h}(5\ell_{T_j})$ holds for any j: Because, by the computability of b_{T_j} from j, we will have a computable function $x \mapsto b_{T_{\iota(x)}}$ which satisfies $\forall x : \mathscr{K}\left(b_{T_{\iota(x)}}\right) \geqslant \overline{h}(5\ell_{T_{\iota(x)}}) > x$ contradicting Lemma 3.2. For showing that $\mathscr{K}(b_{T_j}) \geqslant \overline{h}(5\ell_{T_j})$ holds for any j, we show more generally that for any u, v if $\neg \mathit{Def}_T(u,v)$ holds, for some $T \supseteq \mathit{PA}$, then $\mathscr{K}(u) \geqslant \overline{h}(v)$: If, on the contrary, we have $\mathscr{K}(u) < \overline{h}(v)$ then there exists some j such that (1) $j < \overline{h}(v)$ and (2) $\varphi_j(0)\downarrow = u$. By (2) the number u is definable by the formula "$\varphi_j(0)\downarrow = x$" in PA (and so in T), and by (1) the length of the formula "$\varphi_j(0)\downarrow = x$" is less than v; so $\mathit{Def}_T(u,v)$ should hold, a contradiction. ⊠

Of course, when T is Σ_1-sound then $\neg \mathit{Def}_T(\overline{b_T}, \overline{5} \cdot \overline{\ell_T})$ is independent from T. Also $\mathit{Boolos}_T(\overline{b_T})$ is independent from T: Because if $T \vdash \neg \mathit{Boolos}_T(\overline{b_T})$ then $T \vdash \neg \mathit{Berry}_T(\overline{b_T}, \overline{5} \cdot \overline{\ell_T})$ and so $T \vdash \forall y < \overline{b_T}\ \mathit{Def}_T(y, \overline{5} \cdot \overline{\ell_T}) \to \mathit{Def}_T(\overline{b_T}, \overline{5} \cdot \overline{\ell_T})$. But $\forall y < \overline{b_T}\ \mathit{Def}_T(y, \overline{5} \cdot \overline{\ell_T})$, being a true Σ_1-sentence, is provable in T. Whence, $T \vdash \mathit{Def}_T(\overline{b_T}, \overline{5} \cdot \overline{\ell_T})$, a contradiction. However, we show in the following theorem that if T is not Σ_1-sound then $\mathit{Def}_T(\overline{b_T}, \overline{5} \cdot \overline{\ell_T})$, and so $\neg \mathit{Boolos}_T(\overline{b_T})$, could be provable in T. For the following theorem to make sense we note that there exists a consistent theory S such that $S + \mathit{Con}(S)$ is not consistent: The theory $S = \mathit{PA} + \neg \mathit{Con}(\mathit{PA})$ is consistent by Gödel's Second Incompleteness Theorem, and $S \vdash \neg \mathit{Con}(S)$ because $S \vdash \neg \mathit{Con}(\mathit{PA})$ and $S \supset \mathit{PA}$.

Theorem 4.6 (Non-Rosserizability of Boolos' Proof) *If, for a consistent and* RE *extension T of PA, the theory $T + \mathit{Con}(T)$ is inconsistent then $T \vdash \mathit{Def}_T(\overline{b}, \overline{5} \cdot \overline{\ell_T})$, and so $T \vdash \neg \mathit{Boolos}_T(\overline{b})$, holds for any $b \in \mathbb{N}$.*

Proof If $T \vdash \neg \mathit{Con}(T)$ then $T \vdash \mathit{Pr}_T(\bot)$ and so $T \vdash \mathit{Pr}_T(\psi)$ for any ψ. In particular, if ψ is a formula with length less than $5\ell_T$ (for example $\mathit{Berry}(x,x')$) then $T \vdash \mathit{Pr}_T\big(D(\psi, \overline{b})\big)$ and so $T \vdash \exists x \big[\mathit{len}(x) < \overline{5} \cdot \overline{\ell_T} \wedge \mathit{Pr}_T\big(D(x, \overline{b})\big)\big]$ holds for any b. Thus $T \vdash \mathit{Def}_T(\overline{b}, \overline{5} \cdot \overline{\ell_T})$, whence $T \vdash \neg \mathit{Berry}_T(\overline{b}, \overline{5} \cdot \overline{\ell_T})$ and $T \vdash \neg \mathit{Boolos}_T(\overline{b})$. ⊠

So, if $T + \mathit{Con}(T)$ is not consistent, then $\neg \mathit{Def}_T(\overline{b}, \overline{5} \cdot \overline{\ell_T})$ is not independent from the theory T (neither is $\mathit{Boolos}_T(\overline{b})$) for any b. However, if $T + \mathit{Con}(T)$ is consistent, then a variant of Boolos' proof can go through (cf. [8, Theorem 7.2]) as is shown in the following theorem.

Theorem 4.7 (Boolos' Theorem, optimized) *If for an* RE *extension T of PA the theory $T + \mathit{Con}(T)$ is consistent, then there exists some $b \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\neg \mathit{Def}_T(\overline{b}, \overline{5} \cdot \overline{\ell_T})$, and also $\mathit{Boolos}_T(\overline{b})$, is independent from T.*

Proof First we show that there exists some a such that $T \nvdash \mathit{Def}_T(\overline{a}, \overline{5} \cdot \overline{\ell_T})$. If not, then for any i we have $T \vdash \mathit{Def}_T(\overline{i}, \overline{5} \cdot \overline{\ell_T})$. Let $\Bbbk$ be a fixed number greater than the maximum Gödel codes of formulas φ with $\mathit{len}(\varphi) < 5\ell_T$. So, for any i we have $T \vdash \exists z < \Bbbk\ \mathit{Pr}_T\big(D(z, \overline{i})\big)$. Reason inside T: by Lemma 3.7 there exists some $i \neq j$ and some $z < \Bbbk$ such that $\mathit{Pr}_T\big(D(z, \overline{i}) \wedge D(z, \overline{j})\big)$ and so $\mathit{Pr}_T\big(\overline{i} = \overline{j}\big)$ because $\forall z < \Bbbk \big[D(z,x) \wedge D(z,y) \to x = y\big]$, whence $\neg \mathit{Con}(T)$ since $\overline{i} \neq \overline{j}$. Thus, getting out of T, we have $T \vdash \neg \mathit{Con}(T)$, a contradiction. Let b be the minimum of those a's with $T \nvdash \mathit{Def}_T(\overline{a}, \overline{5} \cdot \overline{\ell_T})$. So, $T \vdash \forall z < \overline{b} \mathit{Def}_T(z, \overline{5} \cdot \overline{\ell_T})$. Now we show that

SUBMITTED MANUSCRIPT

$T \nvdash \neg \mathit{Def}_T(\overline{b}, \overline{5} \cdot \overline{\ell_T})$: If not ($T \vdash \neg \mathit{Def}_T(\overline{b}, \overline{5} \cdot \overline{\ell_T})$) then $T \vdash \mathit{Berry}_T(\overline{b}, \overline{5} \cdot \overline{\ell_T})$ or equivalently, $T \vdash \mathit{Boolos}_T(\overline{b})$. So, b is definable in T by a formula with length less than $5\ell_T$ (see the proof of Theorem 4.3) whence $\mathit{Def}_T(\overline{b}, \overline{5} \cdot \overline{\ell_T})$ is true thus provable in T; a contradiction. Therefore, we showed that $T \nvdash \mathit{Def}_T(\overline{b}, \overline{5} \cdot \overline{\ell_T})$ and $T \nvdash \neg \mathit{Def}_T(\overline{b}, \overline{5} \cdot \overline{\ell_T})$ (also $T \nvdash \mathit{Boolos}_T(\overline{b})$ and $T \nvdash \neg \mathit{Boolos}_T(\overline{b})$). ⊠

Thus, the consistency of $T + \mathit{Con}(T)$ is an optimal (indeed, necessary and sufficient) condition for the independence of a Boolos sentence from T.

5 Concluding Remarks

The following table summarizes some of the new and old results in this paper:

Theorem	Constructive	Rosserizable
GÖDEL (1931) [5]	✓	x [6]
ROSSER (1936) [14]	✓	✓
KLEENE$_1$ (1936) [10]	✓	x Theorem 2.3
KLEENE$_2$ (1950) [11]	✓	✓
CHAITIN (1971) [3]	x [13],[20], Theorem 3.5	✓ Theorem 3.8
BOOLOS (1989) [2]	x Theorem 4.5	x Theorem 4.6

Let us note that for the constructivity of a proof, usually, no new argument is needed as a computational procedure could often be seen from the proof. But the non-cosntructivity of a proof (as in the case of Chaitin's and Boolos' proofs) should be proved; proving the non-constructivity (the non-existence of any algorithm) is usually harder than showing the constructivity (the existence of an algorithm). So is the Rosserizability of a proof. Other than Rosser's proof and Kleene's symmetric theorem (1950) Chaitin's proof is also Rosserizable. The non-Rosserizable proofs of Gödel and Boolos need the consistency of $T + \mathit{Con}(T)$ for the independence of their true but unprovable sentences, and this condition, $\mathit{Con}\big(T + \mathit{Con}(T)\big)$, is optimal (for the independence of that sentences). The authors know no similar optimal condition(s) for the independence of Kleene's sentence in his first (1936) proof.

Note

1. J. Barwise, "Editorial Notes: This Month's Column", *Notices of the American Mathematical Society*, vol 36, no. 4 (1989), page 388.

References

[1] L. D. BEKLEMISHEV, Gödel Incompleteness Theorems and the Limits of their Applicability, I, *Russian Mathematical Surveys* 65 (2010) 857–899. DOI: 10.1070/RM2010v065n05ABEH004703

[2] G. BOOLOS, A New Proof of the Gödel Incompleteness Theorem, *Notices of the American Mathematical Society* 36 (1989) 388–390. Reprinted in *Logic, Logic, and Logic* (ISBN: 9780674537675), Harvard Unviesity Press (1998), pages 383–388.

[3] G. J. CHAITIN, Computational Complexity and Gödel's Incompleteness Theorem, *SIGACT News* 9 (1971) 11–12. DOI: 10.1145/1247066.1247068

SUBMITTED MANUSCRIPT

[4] M. DAVIS, "What is a Computation?", in: L. A. Steen (ed.) *Mathematics Today, Twelve Informal Essays*, Springer (1978) pages 241–267. DOI: 10.1007/978-1-4613-9435-8_10

[5] K. GÖDEL, Über formal unentscheidbare Sätze der Principia Mathematica und verwandter Systeme, I., *Monatshefte für Mathematik und Physik* 38 (1931) 173–198. DOI: 10.1007/BF01700692 Translated as "On Formally Undecidable Propositions of *Principia Mathematica* and Related Systems, I.", in: S. Feferman et al. (eds.), *Kurt Gödel Collected Works, Volume I: Publications 1929–1936* (ISBN: 9780195039641), Oxford University Press (1986) pages 135–152.

[6] D. ISAACSON, "Necessary and Sufficient Conditions for Undecidability of the Gödel Sentence and its Truth", in: D. DeVidi et al. (eds.), *Logic, Mathematics, Philosophy: Vintage Enthusiasms*, Springer (2011) pages 135–152. DOI: 10.1007/978-94-007-0214-1_7

[7] M. KIKUCHI, A Note on Boolos' Proof of the Incompleteness Theorem, *Mathematical Logic Quarterly* 40 (1994) 528–532. DOI: 10.1002/malq.19940400409

[8] M. KIKUCHI and K. TANAKA, On Formalization of Model-Theoretic Proofs of Gödel's Theorems, *Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic* 35 (1994) 403–412. DOI: 10.1305/ndjfl/1040511346

[9] M. KIKUCHI and T. KURAHASHI and H. SAKAI, On Proofs of the Incompleteness Theorems Based on Berry's Paradox by Vopěnka, Chaitin, and Boolos, *Mathematical Logic Quarterly* 58 (2012) 307–316. DOI: 10.1002/malq.201110067

[10] S. C. KLEENE, General Recursive Functions of Natural Numbers, *Mathematische Annalen* 112 (1936) 727–742. DOI: 10.1007/BF01565439

[11] S. C. KLEENE, A Symmetric Form of Gödel's Theorem, *Indagationes Mathematicae* 12 (1950) 244–246. Reviewed in the JSL

[12] H. KOTLARSKI, The Incompleteness Theorems After 70 Years, *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic* 126 (2004) 125–138. DOI: 10.1016/j.apal.2003.10.012

[13] M. VAN LAMBALGEN, Algorithmic Information Theory, *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 54 (1989) 1389–1400. DOI: 10.1017/S0022481200041153

[14] B. ROSSER, Extensions of Some Theorems of Gödel and Church, *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 1 (1936) 87–91. DOI: 10.2307/2269028

[15] D. K. ROY, The Shortest Definition of a Number in Peano Arithmetic, *Mathematical Logic Quarterly* 49 (2003) 83–86. DOI: 10.1002/malq.200310006

[16] S. SALEHI, Gödel's Incompleteness Phenomenon—Computationally, *Philosophia Scientiæ* 18 (2014) 23–37. DOI: 10.4000/philosophiascientiae.968

[17] G. SERÉNY, Boolos-Style Proofs of Limitative Theorems, *Mathematical Logic Quarterly* 50 (2004) 211–216. DOI: 10.1002/malq.200310091

[18] P. SMITH, *An Introduction to Gödel's Theorems*, 2nd edition, Cambridge University Press (2013). ISBN: 9781107606753

[19] C. SMORYŃSKI, "The Incompleteness Theorems", in: J. Barwise (ed.), *Handbook of Mathematical Logic*, North-Holland (1977), pages 821–865. PDF Scan

SUBMITTED MANUSCRIPT

[20] J. C. STILLWELL, *Roads to Infinity: the mathematics of truth and proof*, A K Peters / CRC Press (2010). ISBN: 9781568814667

Acknowledgments

This is a part of the Ph.D. thesis of the second author written at the University of Tabriz under the supervision of the first author who is partially supported by grant №. 94030033 from the Institute for Research in Fundamental Sciences (IPM).

SALEHI
Research Institute for Fundamental Sciences, University of Tabriz
29 Bahman Boulevard, P.O.Box 51666-16471, Tabriz, IRAN
saesal@gmail.com
School of Mathematics, Institute for Research in Fundamental Sciences (IPM)
P.O.Box 19395-5746, Tehran, IRAN
saeedsalehi@ipm.ir, http://saeedsalehi.ir/

SERAJI
Department of Mathematical Sciences, University of Tabriz
29 Bahman Boulevard, P.O.Box 51666-16471, Tabriz, IRAN
payam.seraji54@gmail.com

SUBMITTED MANUSCRIPT